

Another futile attempt by the movie industry who mostly own televised content, to control what can and cant be done with digital content. IMplementations, such as teh Broadcast flag, ultimately will only hurt the consumer - unfair limitations of the flow of information - the very commendity that the United States needs for future success. The facts are simple: the copy protection will be defeated by hackers and will be spread wheather or not a broadcaast flag is created. A broadcast flag will encourage the proliferation! Untimately what do we have then? A higher cost to consumers since all digital devices will need hardware/software support which willl have little effect on protecting what the broadcast flag is intended for. In simplier terms, don't use a sledge hammer to kill a nat. I am unwilling to give up my right to integrate my computers with my digital content (HDTV) - it is my God and government right to persue happiness - which to me is to invent technologie! s and market them, which would be prevented if the broadcast law were to materialize.

I also agree with the following content provided by my peers:

As a consumer of digital content, I have a grave concern about the proposed Broadcast Flag. I enjoy the flexibility and control that technology gives me. I can be more than a passive recipient of content; I can modify, create and participate. Technology currently gives me more choices by allowing me to record a television program and watch it later; clip a small piece of TV and splice it into a home movie; send an email clip of my child's football game to a distant relative; or record a TV program onto a DVD and play it at my friend's apartment. The broadcast flag seems designed to remove this control and flexibility that I enjoy.

Historically, the law has allowed for those not affiliated with creating content to come up with new, unanticipated ways of using it. For example, Sony invented the modern VCR -- a movie studio did not. (Sony did not own a movie studio at the time.) Diamond Multimedia invented the MP3 player -- a recording label did not. Unfortunately, the broadcast flag has the potential to put an end to that dynamic. Because the broadcast flag defines what uses are authorized and which are not, unanticipated uses of content which are not foreseeable today are by default unauthorized. If we allow the content industry to "lock in" the definition of what is and is not legitimate use, we curtail the ability for future innovation - unanticipated but legal uses that will benefit consumers.

I am a law-abiding consumer who believes that piracy should be prevented and prosecuted. However, if theoretical prevention comes at the cost of prohibiting me from making legal, personal use of my content, then the FCC should be working to protect all consumers rather than enable those who would restrict consumer rights. In the case of the broadcast flag, it seems that it will have little effect on piracy. With file-sharing networks, a TV program has only to be cracked once, and it will propagate rapidly across the Internet. So, while I may be required to purchase consumer electronic devices that cost more and allow me to do less, piracy will not be diminished.

In closing, I urge you to require the content industry to demonstrate that its proposed technologies will allow for all legal uses and will actually achieve the stated goal of preventing piracy. If they cannot, I urge you not to mandate the broadcast flag.